



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/913,736	10/31/2001	Takaaki Maekawa	2001-1159A	4021

513 7590 05/13/2003

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.
2033 K STREET N. W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

HRUSKOCI, PETER A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1724

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/913,736	MAEKAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Peter A. Hruskoci	1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 and 13-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1724

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 10, 13, and 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Maeda 5,518,631. It is submitted that Maeda disclose (see col. 2 line 6 through col. 4 line 53, and Example 1) a method for removing phosphoric acid contained in wastewater as recited in the instant claims.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda as above, and further in view of Japanese Patent 11216479 A Tsutomu. The claims differ from Maeda as applied above by reciting that the polymeric solid is selected from a specific group including polyvinyl alcohol. Tsutomu disclose (see Abstract) that it is known in the art to utilize polyvinyl alcohol and calcium carbonate to form a water resistant composition for collecting phosphate in water. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Maeda by utilizing the recited polymeric solid in view of the teaching of Tsutomu, to aid in forming a water resistant composition.

Art Unit: 1724

5. Claims 5-7 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda as above, and further in view of Japanese Patent 11216479 A Tsutomu as above, and further in view of Tanaka et al. The claims differ from Maeda as applied above by reciting that the polymeric solid is a gelled polyvinyl alcohol or multi-layered structure, or formed with a coating layer of calcium alginate. Tanaka et al. disclose (see col. 9 lines 2-13) that it is known in the art to utilize polyvinyl alcohol gel and calcium alginate to aid in forming a carrier material used to treat wastewater. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the references as applied above by utilizing the recited polyvinyl alcohol and calcium alginate in view of the teachings of Tanaka et al., to aid in forming a carrier for the calcium and magnetite. The specific number of layers utilized to form the polymeric solid structure would have been an obvious matter of process optimization to one skilled in the art, depending on the specific wastewater treated and results desired, absent a sufficient showing of unexpected results.

6. Claims 8, 9, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda as above, and further in view of Stoev et al. The claims differ from Maeda as applied above by reciting that the polymeric solid is mechanically vibrated to control surface deposition of calcium phosphate and diffusion of calcium. Stoev et al. disclose (see col. 1 line 21 through col. 2 line 46) that it is known in the art to mechanically vibrate a flocculated slime or wastewater, to aid in liberating impurities and forming a clean flocculated sediment. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the method of Maeda by mechanically

Art Unit: 1724

vibrating the polymeric solid in view of the teaching of Stoev et al., to aid liberating impurities and forming a clean flocculated sediment.

7. Claims 1 and 2 properly written to claims 5-7 would be allowable, in view of pages 5 and 6, and Example 1 of the instant specification.

8. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-10 and 13-19 in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). The restriction requirement is made final.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter A. Hruskoci whose telephone number is (703) 308-3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. David Simmons, can be reached on (703) 308-1972. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9310 (non-after finals) and 703-872-9311 after finals.

Art Unit: 1724

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.


Peter A. Hruskoci
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

P. Hruskoci
May 12, 2003